

## **REMARKS CONCERNING THE AMENDMENTS**

The above amendments have been made in an effort to more clearly define the present invention, respond to the issues raised by the Examiner, and make amendments to the claims as suggested by the Office Action.

Numerous amendments are merely editorial in nature, so as to better distinguish between steps in claim 1 (by labeling them a), b), c),...etc.) and then in avoiding confusion between alternatives (now labeled i) and ii) in step e) of claim 1).

Antecedent basis for other clarifying amendments may be found generally in the specification and, for example, as follows:

- a) “exposing a rank of a dealer’s card” (Page 9, lines 15-23; Page 11, lines 9-16; and page 15, lines 5-12);
- b) “leaving other dealer’s cards unexposed” (Page 11, lines 9-16; and page 15, lines 5-12); and
- c) The limitations added to claim 12 (from original claim 11)

## **RESPONSE TO THE REJECTIONS**

The sole rejection and the issues in the rejection were all under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The specific issues and their resolution under this response and Amendment are:

- 1) Ambiguity in the use of the term “exposing” as it was asserted to be inferential. All appearances of the term have been amended to reflect “exposing of rank.”
- 2) The Examiner suggested that the initial reference to “exposed cards” also positively recite that there would be at some time “unexposed” dealer’s cards. Such a reference has been made in claims 1 and 6.
- 3) The Examiner also objected to the term “poker type” game. That has been amended to recite a “poker” game to address this issue.
- 4) Claims 4 and 9 were rejected as the structural relationship of the Play Wager was not believed to be clear with regard to the other steps in the process.

The claims have been amended to specifically recite the timing of the placement of the Play Wager with regard to another step in the process.

All issues raised in the rejection have been specifically addressed and the issues overcome in the manner suggested by the Examiner, where possible. All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

## CONCLUSION

The rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-10 and 12-20 should be allowed. Upon allowance of these claims, the Examiner is authorized to cancel claim 11 by Examiner's Amendment in order to pass the Application to issue.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicant's attorney of record, Mark A. Litman at (952) 832-9090.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger M. Snow, et al.

By Their Representatives,

MARK A. LITMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.  
York Business Center, Suite 205  
3209 West 76<sup>th</sup> Street  
Edina, Minnesota 55435  
(952) 832-9090

Date: 27 APRIL 2006

By:   
Mark A. Litman  
Reg. No. 26,390